## EXHIBIT 13

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                            MARSHALL DIVISION
     NETLIST, INC.,
                                      ( CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG
 3
                                     )
                Plaintiff,
 4
 5
     VS.
 6
     SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., (
                                       MARSHALL, TEXAS
     et al.,
                                      ( MARCH 28, 2023
 7
               Defendants.
                                     ) 9:00 A.M.
 8
 9
                                 VOLUME 1
10
11
                           PRETRIAL CONFERENCE
12
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP
                    UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
                        SHAWN McROBERTS, RMR, CRR
                          100 E. HOUSTON STREET
                          MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
23
                              (903) 923-8546
                    shawn mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov
24
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

Samsung's DDR4 load-reduced dual in-line memory modules, LRDIMMs. This is their infringement contentions.

After identifying specific models, they say, well, wait a minute, that's not everything. Just to be clear, our DDR4 patents are asserted against any other Samsung DDR4 LRDIMM products made, sold, offered for sale, so forth, that are JEDEC standard compliant memory modules.

So they are making JEDEC standard compliance an issue in this case. And if they are able to prove infringement, it has to be conformed to the theories they disclose in their infringement contentions. Otherwise, they're outside the bounds of what they provided notice for throughout this case.

So they are stuck with this theory, Your Honor. Both in their infringement contentions and through their expert reports, they have repeatedly pointed to JEDEC compliance in their -- with respect to their accusations.

These are their infringement contentions with respect to the '506 and '339 Patent. They identify specific JEDEC standards. In fact, the very first element for the '506 1[i] says, a first data buffer, and they're citing JEDEC standards. The '339 Patent, they cite another JEDEC standard, JESD82-31A.

So Mr. Halbert took that, took them at their word, looked at their infringement contentions, and said, okay, I'm going to look at first DDR4 LRDIMM standards, I'm going to look at DDR5 standards, and I'm going to look at the specific

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

2.4

25

which is identified as paragraphs 289 through 305 of Mr. Meyer's rebuttal report, I'm going to grant the motion and strike those paragraphs. I think they do fall within the purview of *Apple versus Wi-Lan* and they are probably not reliable in light of that and other precedent.

With regard to the references to RAND, I'm going to grant that portion of the motion as we've established beyond doubt today there are no standard essential patents at issue in this case. Therefore, any mention of a RAND contractual obligation would violate Rule 403 and be highly confusing and prejudicial with limited, if any, probative value.

With reference to the NIAs, I'm going to deny that portion of the motion.

With regard to the references to other litigation and IPRs, consistent with the Court's earlier discussed practices, I'm going to grant that. Again, I think that's mandated by a fair application of Rule 403 where there's considerable risk of prejudice and confusion and limited probative value.

With regard to the references to the alleged JEDEC contributions, I'm going to deny that portion of the motion. I believe this witness is entitled to respond to Mr. Kennedy's opinions. Particularly in that regard, I don't find anything in this section of his report that cannot fairly be addressed by Plaintiff through cross-examination and rises to the level of needing to be excluded.

261

1	59474
1	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A
2	CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF
3	PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.
4	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE TRANSCRIPT FEES
5	FORMAT COMPLY WITH THOSE PRESCRIBED BY THE
6	COURT AND THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE
7	UNITED STATES.
8	
9	S/Shawn McRoberts 04/02/2023
10	DATEDATE
11	SHAWN MCROBERTS, RMR, CRR FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	